

WITHDRAWAL OF THE PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS *VESPERTILIO SUBULATUS* SAY UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1701
(see volume 22, pages 204-205)

By Bryan P. Glass (*Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, U.S.A.*)

Some months ago Mr. Robert J. Baker and I submitted a proposal to the Commission relative to the American bats *Myotis subulatus* and *Myotis yumanensis*. Since that time there has been considerable opposition to this proposal generated among mammalogists in North America, particularly because this seems to be proposing a nomenclatural solution to what is basically a taxonomic problem. With this position we agree, and note further that such a proposal unjustifiably establishes the name *Myotis yumanensis* by placing it on the Official List, whereas such action ought not to be taken since it unnecessarily protects the name *yumanensis* from further nomenclatural examination to which it might very reasonably be subjected at some future date. We therefore wish to retract our proposal and will express our opinion regarding the status of these names through the normal channels of publication.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION TO PLACE FISCHER'S NAMES FOR D'AZARA'S RODENTS ON THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.) 1774
(see volume 23, pages 285-288)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

When Fischer used such expressions as "*Mus tarso nigra*" and "*Mus laucha et lauchita*," are these not non-binominal names? Does this not becloud the status of the work as a whole (Article 11c)?

Actually, on page 71, Fischer may not have been giving formal Latin scientific names to the species of *Mus*. He was listing names from the literature, and for d'Azara he was translating them directly into Latin (e.g., "*Mus tarso nigro*" for "*Rat a Tarse Noir*"). It is true that they are italicized, but that was his format for the names referred to, regardless of language or form, as in such names, in the same list, as "*Norway rat, brown rat*" (p. 69) and "*Malot*", "*Field-rat*", and "*Skogsmus*" (p. 65).

I note also that in a synopsis at the beginning of the volume, Fischer sometimes uses different names than in the text, and furthermore in most cases apparently really Latinizes them as scientific names. For example:

	Synopsis	Text
p. vii	<i>Mus nigritaris</i>	<i>Mus tarso nigro</i> (which, by the way, violates Article 11g)!
p. xi	<i>Mustela</i> , species dubiae: <i>Ictis Veterum</i> <i>Sardiniae</i>	Under <i>Mustela</i> : <i>L'ictis des Anciens</i> <i>L'ictis de Sardaigne</i>
p. xvii	<i>Cervus Cuguacuate</i>	<i>Cougoua couété</i>

If any names were to be adopted as Fischer's Latin rendering of d'Azara's names, it would seem that those in the Synopsis are more proper for consideration.

I hope that this work will be scrutinized carefully by mammalogists and nomenclaturists, before a decision is reached on the Fischer names.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED BACK-DATING OF *COLLIGNONICERAS BREISTROFFER*. Z.N.(S.) 1738
(see volume 23, pages 57-59)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Questions will arise from time to time on the status of decisions made under provisions that existed only briefly in the Code (e.g., Article 39a, involved in the present case). At stake will be any usage based on such a decision, versus application of the